



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/132,327	08/11/1998	MICHEL SAFARS	USB97-SVN-OM	9217
22511 7590 10/02/2008 OSHA LIANG L.L.P. TWO HOUSTON CENTER 909 FANNIN, SUITE 3500 HOUSTON, TX 77010				
EXAMINER				
PAULA, CESAR B				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2178				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/02/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docketing@oshaliang.com
buta@oshaliang.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/132,327

Applicant(s)

SAFARS ET AL.

Examiner

CESAR B. PAULA

Art Unit

2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 July 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 79-81, 83, 85-92 and 95-101 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 79-81, 83, 85-92, and 95-101 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/C)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the RCE amendment filed on 7/25/2008.

This action is made Non-Final.

2. In the amendment, claim 84 has been canceled. Claims 99-101 have been added. Claims 79-81, 83, 85-92, and 95-101 are pending in the case. Claim 79 is an independent claim.
3. The rejections of claims 79-80, 90, and 98 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Robertson et al, hereinafter Robertson (Pat.# 6,486,895, 11/26/02, filed on 9/8/95), have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.
4. The rejections of claims 81, 83-89, 91-92, and 95-97 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robertson, in view of Lemay et al "Laura Lemay's Web Workshop Microsoft FrontPage 97", Sams.net, 1/17/1997, pp.341-364, 539-569), and further in view of Fleming (Pat.# 6,473,752, 10/29/2002, filed on 12/4/1997), have been withdrawn as necessitated by the amendment.

Claim Objections

5. Claim 101 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 101 recites 'an indicator'(line 3, last parag.) , which better reads as 'an indicator'. Appropriate correction is required.

Priority

6. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), and based on application # PCT/FR98/00917 filed in France on 5/6/1998, which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Drawings

7. This application has been filed with informal drawings which are acceptable for examination purposes only. Formal drawings will be required when the application is allowed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 79-80, 90, and 98-100 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robertson et al, hereinafter Robertson (Pat.# 6,486,895, 11/26/02, filed on 9/8/95), in view of Blue Squirrel WebWhacker, hereinafter Webwhacker, macintosh manual, Blue Squirrel, 1997.

Regarding independent claim 79, Robertson teaches displaying a list of webpages, as a Webbook, downloaded from the Internet. The Webbook is organized in accordance to a

list of pages, which indicates the way the pages are placed or located in the Webbook, starting with the homepage. The pages found in the book are navigated backwards and forwards using numerous methods including point and click, left/right gestures from starting page (c.2, L.16-50, c.7, L.14-67, c.6,L.1-67 and c.8,L.50-c. 9, L.67)-- *wherein the book metaphor enforces sequential navigation through the first plurality of electronic documents defined by the first order, and wherein the book metaphor enables a user to select one of the plurality of electronic documents from which to begin the sequential navigation; obtaining a first plurality of electronic documents, wherein each of the first plurality of electronic documents is obtained from one of a plurality of sources; presenting the first plurality of electronic documents using a book metaphor, wherein the first plurality of electronic documents is organized within the book metaphor using a first order and wherein the first order defines a location of each of the first plurality of electronic documents within the book metaphor, obtaining a first additional electronic document; wherein the book metaphor enforces sequential navigation through the first plurality of electronic documents in an order defined by the second order after execution of the computer program.*

Moreover, Robertson discloses the addition of web pages to a given electronic book. These web pages are converted into software objects that have a common architecture, and which perform different specific functions for specifying layout, and to indicate ruffling of the pages. The list of pages can be modified by a user based on various techniques, including displaying the list with or without a cover (c.2, L.14-67, c.6,L.10-67, c.7,L.35, and c.8, L.50-c.9,L.67)--*modify the first order of the first plurality of electronic documents to obtain a second order; executing the computer program, wherein executing of the computer program results in*

modifying the order for the plurality of electronic documents such that the plurality of electronic documents are arranged in the second order, wherein the second order defines a location of each of the first plurality of electronic documents within the book metaphor. Robertson fails to explicitly disclose *wherein the first additional electronic document comprises a computer program configured to, when executed, modify the first order of the first plurality of electronic documents to obtain a second order wherein the relative location of at least one of the first plurality of documents in the first order is different than the relative location of the at least one of the first plurality of documents in the second order.* However, Webwhacker teaches moving webpages, via their urls, from one category to another category within a group of downloaded webpages (3-15--3-17). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Robertson, and Webwhacker, because of all the teachings found in Webwhacker, including allowing inexperienced users to easily, and with minimal effort move webpages without having to go online or retype the information (3-17, parag.1).

Regarding claim 80, which depends on claim 79, Robertson discloses the addition of web pages to a given electronic book. These web pages are converted into software objects that have a common architecture, and which perform different specific functions for specifying layout, and to indicate ruffling of the pages -- *adding the first additional electronic document into the second order within the book metaphor* (c.2, L.14-67, and c.6,L.10-67).

Regarding claim 90, which depends on claim 79, Robertson fails to explicitly disclose *the location of each of the first plurality of documents defined in the second order is one selected*

from a group consisting of a chapter in the book metaphor and a sub-chapter in the book metaphor. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have divided the electronic book into chapters, because of all the teachings found in Robertson, including the organization of a document in a book metaphor(col.1, lines 65-col.2, line 50), and the inclusion of chapters would have enabled a user to organize documents in such fashion.

Regarding claim 98, which depends on claim 79, Robertson discloses the addition of web pages, downloaded from the Internet—*third party website*, to a given electronic book. (c.2, L.14-67, and c.6,L.10-67).

Regarding claim 99, which depends on claim 79, Robertson teaches displaying a list of webpages, as a Webbook, downloaded from the Internet. The Webbook is sequentially organized in accordance to a list of pages sequentially downloaded, which indicates the way the pages are placed or located in the Webbook, in relation to the url address of the homepage (c.7, L.14-67, col.2, lines 14-67)— *wherein the first order is based on a URL address associated with each of the first plurality of electronic documents.*

Regarding claim 100, which depends on claim 79, Robertson teaches displaying a list of webpages, as a Webbook, downloaded from the Internet. The Webbook is sequentially organized in accordance to a list of pages sequentially downloaded, which indicates the way the pages are placed or located in the Webbook, starting with the homepage (c.7, L.14-67)-- *wherein the first order is based on a chronological order in which each of the first plurality of electronic*

documents was obtained from the plurality of sources, wherein each of the plurality of sources is accessible over a network.

10. Claims 85-89, 91-92, and 95-97 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robertson, in view of Webwhacker as applied above to claim 79, further in view of Lemay et al "Laura Lemay's Web Workshop Microsoft FrontPage 97", Sams.net, 1/17/1997, pp.341-364, 539-569), and further in view of Fleming (Pat.# 6,473,752, 10/29/2002, filed on 12/4/1997).

Regarding claim 85, which depends on claim 79, Robertson discloses the addition of web pages to a given electronic book. These web pages are converted into software objects that have a common architecture, and which perform different specific functions for specifying layout, and to indicate ruffling of the pages--*obtaining a second additional electronic document, adding the second additional electronic document into the second order within the book metaphor* (c.2, L.14-67, and c.6,L.10-67). Robertson fails to explicitly disclose *the second additional electronic document comprises a computer program configured to, when executed, provide search functionality to enable a user to search for content located in at least one of the first plurality of electronic documents*. However, Lemay teaches using web bots stored in a web page, for searching web pages located in a website (page 542). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Robertson, and Lemay, because of all the teachings found in Lemay, including allowing inexperienced users to easily, and with

minimal effort insert web bots or scripts for performing certain automatic web page functions, such as the search above (page 342).

Regarding claim 86, which depends on claim 79, Robertson discloses the addition of web pages to a given electronic book. These web pages are converted into software objects that have a common architecture, and which perform different specific functions for specifying layout, and to indicate ruffling of the pages-- *obtaining a second additional electronic document, adding the second additional electronic document into the second order within the book metaphor* (c.2, L.14-67, and c.6,L.10-67). Robertson fails to explicitly disclose *the second additional electronic document comprises a computer program configured to, when executed: generate a summary of content located in at least one of the first plurality of electronic documents*. However, Lemay teaches using web bots stored in a web page, for generating a table of content of web pages located in a website (pages 356-359). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Robertson, and Lemay, because of all the teachings found in Lemay, including allowing inexperienced users to easily, and with minimal effort insert web bots or scripts for performing automatic web page tasks, such as the generation of a table of contents pages above (page 342).

Regarding claim 87, which depends on claim 86, Robertson discloses the addition of web pages to a given electronic book. These web pages are converted into software objects that have a common architecture, and which perform different specific functions for specifying layout, and

to indicate ruffling of the pages-- *adding the second additional electronic document into the second order within the book metaphor* (c.2, L.14-67, and c.6,L.10-67).

Regarding claim 88, which depends on claim 79, Robertson discloses the addition of web pages to a given electronic book. These web pages are converted into software objects that have a common architecture, and which perform different specific functions for specifying layout, and to indicate ruffling of the pages-- *obtaining a second additional electronic document, adding the second additional electronic document into the second order within the book metaphor* (c.2, L.14-67, and c.6,L.10-67). Robertson fails to explicitly disclose *the second additional electronic document comprises a computer program configured to, when executed: generate an index of content located in at least one of the first plurality of electronic documents*. However, Lemay teaches using web bots stored in a web page, for generating a table of content of web pages located in a website (pages 356-359). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Robertson, and Lemay, because of all the teachings found in Lemay, including allowing inexperienced users to easily, and with minimal effort insert web bots or scripts for performing automatic web page tasks, such as the generation of a table of contents pages above (page 342).

Regarding claim 89, which depends on claim 88, Robertson discloses the addition of web pages to a given electronic book. These web pages are converted into software objects that have a common architecture, and which perform different specific functions for specifying layout, and

to indicate ruffling of the pages-- *adding the second additional electronic document into the second order within the book metaphor* (c.2, L.14-67, and c.6,L.10-67).

Regarding claim 91, which depends on claim 79, Robertson discloses the addition of web pages to a given electronic book. These web pages are converted into software objects that have a common architecture, and which perform different specific functions for specifying layout, and to indicate ruffling of the pages-- *obtaining a second additional electronic document* (c.2, L.14-67, and c.6,L.10-67). Robertson fails to explicitly disclose *obtaining a second additional electronic document, wherein the second additional electronic document comprises a computer program configured to, when executed: enforce selective access to at least one of the first plurality of electronic documents*. However, Lemay teaches using web bots registration component stored in a web page, for preventing access to a web page(s) unless the user provides user names and passwords (page 541). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Robertson, Webwhacker, and Lemay, because of all the teachings found in Lemay, including allowing inexperienced users to easily, and with minimal effort insert web bots or scripts for performing automatic web page tasks, such as the protection of web pages above (page 342).

Regarding claim 92, which depends on claim 79, Robertson discloses the addition of web pages to a given electronic book. These web pages are converted into software objects that have a common architecture, and which perform different specific functions for specifying layout, and to indicate ruffling of the pages (c.2, L.14-67, and c.6,L.10-67)--*wherein the second plurality of*

electronic documents are presented using a catalogue metaphor, and wherein the catalogue metaphor comprises, for at least one of the second plurality of electronic documents, a description of the computer program and a preview of functionality provided by the computer program. Robertson fails to explicitly disclose *each of the second plurality of electronic documents comprises a computer program.* However, Lemay teaches using web bots stored in a web page, for inserting substitution information into each web page the bot is stored (pages 352-354). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Robertson, Webwhacker, and Lemay, because of all the teachings found in Lemay, including allowing inexperienced users to easily, and with minimal effort insert web bots or scripts for performing automatic web page tasks, such as the placing of information into web pages above (page 342).

Regarding claim 95, Robertson discloses the organization of a document in a book metaphor-- *the second plurality of electronic documents are presented using a catalogue metaphor* (col.1, lines 65-col.2, line 50).

Regarding claim 96, which depends on claim 92, Robertson discloses the addition of web pages to a given electronic book. These web pages are converted into software objects that have a common architecture, and which perform different specific functions for specifying layout, and to indicate ruffling of the pages(c.2, L.14-67, and c.6,L.10-67).

Regarding claim 97, which depends on claim 92, Robertson discloses the addition of web pages to a given electronic book. These web pages are presented in a bookshelf presentation-- *the book metaphor and the catalogue metaphor are presented using a library shelf metaphor* (c.2, L.14-67, and c.6,L.10-67, col.10, lines 28-36).

11. Claim 81 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robertson, in view of Webwhacker as applied above to claim 79, further in view of Nehab et al (USPat.# 6029182, 2/22/2000, filed on 10/4/1996), and further in view of Lemay, and further in view of Fleming.

Regarding claim 81, which depends on claim 79, Robertson discloses the addition of web pages to a given electronic book. These web pages are converted into software objects that have a common architecture, and which perform different specific functions for specifying layout, and to indicate ruffling of the pages-- *obtaining a second additional electronic document, adding the second additional electronic document into the second order within the book metaphor* (c.2, L.14-67, and c.6,L.10-67). Robertson fails to explicitly disclose *wherein the second additional electronic document comprises a computer program configured to, when executed, obtain usage information, within the book metaphor, of the first plurality of electronic documents, wherein the usage information specifies a duration of time at least one user viewed of the first plurality of electronic documents*. However, Lemay teaches using web bots stored in a web page, for performing many tasks (pages 342-345). Fleming teaches a document monitor for the recording of document usage information, which include the time and duration of document access (col.5,

lines 49-61, col.4, lines 1-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Robertson, Webwhacker, and Lemay, because of all the teachings found in Lemay, including allowing inexperienced users to easily, and with minimal effort insert web bots or scripts to automate, and enhance web pages (pages 342, 341), and all the reasons found in Fleming, including the retrieval of documents of most interest to the user (col.3, lines 24-34, col.2, lines 27-67).

12. Claim 83 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robertson, in view of Webwhacker as applied above to claim 79, further in view of Nehab et al (USPat.# 6029182, 2/22/2000, filed on 10/4/1996), and further in view of Fleming.

Regarding claim 83, which depends on claim 79, Robertson discloses the addition of web pages to a given electronic book. These web pages are converted into software objects that have a common architecture, and which perform different specific functions for specifying layout, and to indicate ruffling of the pages (c.2, L.14-67, and c.6,L.10-67). Robertson fails to explicitly disclose *logging usage information for the user of at least one of the first plurality of electronic documents, wherein the usage information comprises action type, action description, a userID corresponding to the user, and a time stamp denoting the time of an action of the action type was performed*. However, Nehab teaches a log for storing sites visited by a user. The log is associated with the user ID, in order to identify the user who owns the log (col.8, lines 27-67, col.20, lines 50-54). Fleming teaches the recording of document usage information, which include action type

and description, the time and duration of document access (col.5, lines 49-61). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Robertson, Webwhacker, Nehab, and Fleming, because of all the teachings found in Nehab, including personalizing webpages based on user's preferences (col.4, lines 1-12), and all the reasons found in Fleming, including the retrieval of documents of most interest to the user (col.3, lines 24-34, col.2, lines 27-67).

13. Claim 83 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robertson, in view of Webwhacker as applied above to claim 79, further in view of Nehab et al (USPat.# 6029182, 2/22/2000, filed on 10/4/1996), and further in view of 'CLIENT/SERVER END-TO-END RESPONSE TIME: REAL LIFE EXPERIENCE', Mark Maccabee, IBM Thomas J. Watson Research Center Yorktown Heights, NY, 1996.

Regarding claim 83, which depends on claim 79, Robertson discloses the addition of web pages to a given electronic book. These web pages are converted into software objects that have a common architecture, and which perform different specific functions for specifying layout, and to indicate ruffling of the pages (c.2, L.14-67, and c.6,L.10-67). Robertson fails to explicitly disclose *logging usage information for the user of at least one of the first plurality of electronic documents, wherein the usage information comprises action type, action description, a userID corresponding to the user, and a time stamp denoting the time of an action of the action type was performed*. However, Nehab teaches a log for storing sites visited by a user. The log is associated with the user ID, in order to identify the user who owns the log (col.8, lines 27-67, col.20, lines

50-54). Maccabee teaches the recording of transaction usage information, which include number of relational records retrieved, and the type of report created, the time and duration(start/end time) of document access (pages.5-6). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Robertson, Nehab, and Maccabee, because of all the teachings found in Nehab, including personalizing webpages based on user's preferences (col.4, lines 1-12), and all the reasons found in Maccabee, including measuring retrieval improvement once changes are made (page 11, last parag.-page 12).

14. Claim 81 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robertson, in view of Webwhacker as applied above to claim 79, further in view of Lemay, and further in view of Maccabee.

Regarding claim 81, which depends on claim 79, Robertson discloses the addition of web pages to a given electronic book. These web pages are converted into software objects that have a common architecture, and which perform different specific functions for specifying layout, and to indicate ruffling of the pages-- *obtaining a second additional electronic document, adding the second additional electronic document into the second order within the book metaphor* (c.2, L.14-67, and c.6,L.10-67). Robertson fails to explicitly disclose *wherein the second additional electronic document comprises a computer program configured to, when executed, obtain usage information, within the book metaphor, of the first plurality of electronic documents, wherein the usage information specifies a duration of time at least one user viewed of the first plurality of electronic documents*. However, Lemay teaches using web bots stored in a web page, for

performing many tasks (pages 342-345). Maccabee teaches the recording of transaction usage information, which include number of relational records retrieved, and the type of report created, the time and duration(start/end time) of document access (pages.5-6). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Robertson, Webwhacker, Lemay and Maccabee, because of all the teachings found in Nehab, including personalizing webpages based on user's preferences (col.4, lines 1-12), and all the reasons found in Maccabee, including measuring retrieval improvement once changes are made (page 11, last parag.-page 12).

15. Claim 101 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Robertson, in view of Webwhacker as applied above to claim 79, further in view of Lemay.

Regarding claim 101, which depends on claim 79, Robertson discloses the addition of web pages to a given electronic book. These web pages are converted into software objects that have a common architecture, and which perform different specific functions for specifying layout, and to indicate ruffling of the pages-- *obtaining a second additional electronic document and adding the second additional electronic document into the second order within the book metaphor* (c.2, L.14-67, and c.6,L.10-67). Robertson fails to explicitly disclose, *wherein the second additional electronic document comprises a computer program configured to, when executed, generate a table of contents; wherein an entry in the table of contents corresponds to a local copy of one of the first plurality of electronic documents, wherein the entry comprises an indicator that indicates whether the local copy is different than a remote copy of the one of the*

first plurality of electronic documents located at the corresponding one of the plurality of sources. However, Lemay teaches using web bots stored in a web page, for performing many tasks (pages 342-345). Web bots are stored in a web page, for generating a table of content of web pages located in a website (pages 356-359). Fleming teaches a document monitor for the recording of document usage information, which include the time and duration of document access (col.5, lines 49-61, col.4, lines 1-67). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of Robertson, Webwhacker, and Lemay, because of all the teachings found in Lemay, including allowing inexperienced users to easily, and with minimal effort insert web bots or scripts to automate, and enhance web pages (pages 342, 341).

Response to Arguments

16. Applicants' arguments filed 7/25/2008 have been fully considered but they are moot. The Applicant submits that a confirmation is needed of reception of original translation (filed on 1/2/, and 2/18/1998) of provisional application 60/055,608 filed on 8/14/1997 (page 8, parag.2). The English translation is not part of the record with the Patent Office. However, the Applicant is invited to resubmit a such translation, in order to be given proper consideration to the merits of arguments filed herewith.

Regarding claim 79, the Applicant indicates that the references fail to teach or suggest the reordering of the pages in the electronic book (pages 10-11). The Examiner Applicant is directed towards the new rejection of this limitation in light of the recent amendment.

The Applicant notes that 'At the outset the Applicants assert that Fleming is not prior art to at least claims 83, 85, 86,87, 88, 89, 91, 97, and 98. Specifically, the referenced application claims priority to U.S. Provisional Application No. 60/055,608 filed on August 14, 1997 (hereafter "provisional application")' (page 11). As indicated above, the Examiner cannot examine the merits of this argument, since the provisional application is in the French language without any English translation as purported by Applicant.

Conclusion

I. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Cesar B. Paula whose telephone number is (571) 272-4128. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong, can be reached on (571) 272-4124. However, in such a case, please allow at least one business day.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, go to <http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair>. Should you have any questions about

Art Unit: 2178

access to the Private PAIR system, please contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866 217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, please call 800-786-9199 or 571 272-1000 (USA or Canada).

Any response to this Action should be mailed to:
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or faxed to:

- **(571)-273-8300** (for **all** Formal communications intended for entry)

	/CESAR B PAULA/ Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2178
--	--

9/30/2008